

2020 WL 13561758

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States Court of Appeals,
District of Columbia Circuit.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER and Labor
Council for Latin American Advancement, Appellees

v.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET, et al., Appellants

No. 19-5130

|
September Term, 2019

|
Filed On: June 9, 2020

1:17-cv-02458-TSC

Attorneys and Law Firms

Sunu Chandy, Emily Martin, Maya Raghu, National Women's Law Center, Washington, DC, Jeffrey B. Dubner, Robin Thurston, Democracy Forward Foundation, Washington, DC, for Appellees.

Lindsey Powell, Daniel Tenny, Hashim M. Mooppan, Esquire, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Appellants Office of Management And Budget, John Michael Mulvaney, Director, Office of Management And Budget, Paul Ray, Acting Administrator, Office of Information And Regulatory Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Janet Dhillon, Chair, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Lawrence J. Joseph, Law Office of Lawrence J. Joseph, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellant Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund.

Ellen Louise Eardley, Mehri & Skalet, PLLC, Washington, DC, for Amici Curiae for Appellees Jenny R. Yang, Patricia A. Shiu.

Camille A. Olson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Chicago, IL, Daryl Langdon Joseffer, U.S. Chamber Litigation Center, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

Camille A. Olson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Chicago, IL, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee HR Policy Association.

Carolyn L. Wheeler, Katz Banks Kumin LLP, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee Statisticians, Economists, Management Researchers, and Other Employment Analysts.

Camille A. Olson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Chicago, IL, Lawrence Zel Lorber, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Washington, DC, Peter Clinton Tolsdorf, National Association of Manufacturers, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee National Association of Manufacturers.

Ryan E. Griffin, James & Hoffman, P.C., Washington, DC, for Amici Curiae for Appellees 9TO5, National Association of Working Women, American Association of University Women, A. Better Balance, Coalition of Labor Union Women, Equal Rights Advocates, Employee Rights Advocacy Institute for Law & Policy, California Women's Law Center, Family Values @ Work, Gender Justice, Institute for Women's Policy Research, KWH Law Center for Social Justice and Change, Legal Aid at Work, Legal Momentum, Legal Voice, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, National Center for Law and Economic Justice, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Employment Law Project, National Organization for Women Foundation, National Partnership for Women & Families, Women Employed, Women's Law Center of Maryland, Womens' Law Project.

Camille A. Olson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Chicago, IL, Lawrence Zel Lorber, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Washington, DC, for Amici Curiae for Appellees American Bankers Association, American Society of Employers, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Institute for Workplace Equality, National Federation of Independent Business, National Retail Federation, Restaurant Law Center, Retail Litigation Center, Inc., Society for Human Resource Management.

Camille A. Olson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Chicago, IL, Lawrence Zel Lorber, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, Washington, DC, Rae Thiesfield Vann, Carlton Fields, PA, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee Center for Workplace Compliance.

Kymberly K. Evanson, Pacifica Law Group LLP, Seattle, WA, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee Democratic Women's Caucus and Individual Legislators.

Lisa Catherine Ehrlich, Office of the Attorney General, State of California, Oakland, CA, for Amici Curiae for Appellees California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, State of Delaware, Illinois Department of Human Rights, Maine Human Rights Commission, Maryland Commission on Civil Rights, Minnesota Department of Human Rights, Nevada Equal Rights Commission, New Jersey Division on Civil Rights, State of New York, Oregon Bureau of Labor And Industries, Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Rhode Island Commission for Human Rights, Virginia Office of the Attorney General, Division of Human Rights, Washington State Human Rights Commission, Baltimore Office of Civil Rights and Wage Enforcement, New York City Commission on Human Rights.

Karl A. Racine, Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia Office of the Solicitor General, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae for Appellee District of Columbia.

BEFORE: Srinivasan, Chief Judge, and Rogers and Pillard, Circuit Judges.

ORDER

Per Curiam

*1 Following briefing and oral argument on the merits of the appeal, the government moved to dismiss the appeal as moot and to vacate the district court's opinion and orders. Upon consideration of the government's motion, the response thereto, and the government's reply, it is

ORDERED that the government's motion be granted in part and this appeal be dismissed as moot in light of the parties' agreement that the government has substantially complied with the district court's post-judgment orders. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the case be remanded to the district court with instructions to consider the appellants' request for vacatur as a motion for relief from an order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). *See U.S. Bancorp Mortg. Co. v. Bonner Mall P'ship*, 513 U.S. 18, 29 (1994). The district court is well positioned to assess whether the government has carried its burden to show "equitable entitlement to the extraordinary remedy of vacatur," *id.* at 26, including whether the government's failure to seek a stay pending appeal or take similarly protective measures amounts to an omission that "voluntarily forfeited" any "claim to the equitable remedy of vacatur," *id.* at 25.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing *en banc*. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. R. 41(a)(1).

All Citations

Not Reported in Fed. Rptr., 2020 WL 13561758

End of Document